DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 481 954 JC 030 589

TITLE	Information Technology--Instructional Faculty Responses 1997, 1999 and 2001. Survey Series.
INSTITUTION	City Coll. of San Francisco, CA. Office of Institutional Development, Research, and Planning.
PUB DATE	2003-01-00
NOTE	27p.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.ccsf.edu/Offices/Research_Planning/pdf/rep101.pdf.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Colleges; Computer Literacy; Computers; Educational Technology; Faculty; *Information Technology; School Surveys; *Technology Uses in Education; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*City College of San Francisco CA

ABSTRACT

This document focuses on a faculty survey that has been conducted at the City College of San Francisco for the years 1997, 1999, and 2001. The data for the different years is compared using tables for each question. The goal of the survey is to collect trends in regards to information technology. The number of faculty respondents was the largest in 1997 (645) in comparison to 1999 (476) and 2001 (405). The majority of faculty for all three years consider themselves to have an intermediate level of computer expertise. Some of the key findings of the report are as follows: (1) the majority (56%) of faculty in 2001 include their email address on the syllabi as opposed to a minority (20%) in 1997; (2) majority (70%) of faculty in 2003 have send emails to students; (3) faculty have increasingly begun using computers for work and overall 95% of respondents use computers at least once a week; (4) faculty are currently having reduced problems in access to instructional classrooms, technical support, and access to computer labs; (5) the use of the Internet and electronic data bases has increased 100% over the time period covered in the report; and (6) faculty have begun to see more value in using technology to improve overall quality of teaching. Contains 11 tables and 7 appendices. (MZ)

SURVEY SERIES

Information Technology
Instructional Faculty Responses • 1997, 1999 and 2001

City College of San Francisco

Report Prepared By:
Steve Levinson, English Faculty
slevinso@ccsf.edu

Researcher:
Pamela M. Mery
pmery@ccsf.edu

Office of Research, Planning and Grants
January 2003

City College of San Francisco
50 Phelan Avenue, C306
San Francisco, CA 94112
415.239.3014 Fax 415.239.3010

1. Introduction

In 2001, the Office of Research conducted its biennial technology survey of all personnel in the College to assess use of and progress in acquiring computer skills. This same survey was given in 1997 and in 1999, and a survey of smaller scale in 1994, so there are adequate benchmarks to detect important trends. This report will focus on the response of instructional faculty, referred to throughout the report as "faculty." A subsequent report will deal with student service faculty, and department chairs as well as classified staff, and administration.

Table 1
Instructional Faculty Respondents

	1997	1999	2001
Total Number of Respondents	645	476	405

The number of faculty survey participants (Table 1) has declined but remains substantial. The decline in participants may be caused by survey fatigue, but it may also reflect that the surge of interest in computer technology that took place in the mid 90's has begun to taper off. This report will flag a number of areas where interest and progress appear to have leveled off. The number of participants is still large enough so we can still assume we are measuring roughly the same cohort each year, but we must be cautious in extrapolating these numbers to the faculty as a whole.

The results from this survey clearly show that faculty have made advances and that computer use, e-mail in particular, is a vital part of academic lives and instruction at City College of San Francisco. At the same time, the survey indicates that in a number of areas this progress is not being sustained.

2. Level of Expertise

Faculty assess their skills in use of instructional software at higher levels than in 1997, but there has been no significant increase over the last two years. Interpreting these self evaluations is a bit problematic because no criteria are given for each of the categories, and the target tends to move as more computer possibilities become available. For example, in the mid '90s, the web and data bases provided through our library were just beginning to attain the power and strength we recognize now. In the most recent survey in 2001, results suggest that an intermediate user most surely did word processing, likely used spreadsheets, and considered him/herself moderate in use of web skills. It is

unlikely that an intermediate user would be comfortable with presentation software or desktop publishing. It is interesting that in a parallel study of degree applicants at CCSF, students responded with a similar assessment of their skills. It may be that the nature of the question invites responses in the intermediate areas. Another way of confirming that faculty have moved beyond basic computer skills is seen in the Technology Learning Center (TLC) report which states that the TLC has "changed the emphasis in generic workshops from office applications basic skills and Pine E-mail to Web Development/Web e-mail/Graphics/PowerPoint and provided more basics directly to departments" (Technology Learning Center: Summary of Activities, Projects and Support Services 2001/02).

Looking at this survey data and at current TLC offerings, we might infer that the great percentage of faculty now use e-mail and do word processing where earlier we knew that faculty were flocking to workshops to develop these skills.

Table 2
My level of computer expertise is:

	1997	1999	2001
Non-computer user	6.55%	2.55	2.97
Beginner	23.09	17.23	17.08
Intermediate	51.79	57.87	59.16
Advanced	18.56	22.34	20.79

3. Current Use of Computer Technology

The questions on use of technology (e.g., "which types of software products do you use") are more definitive than self assessment of expertise (Table 2) because they require less judgment by the respondent. Many of these results are encouraging because they do show an increase of expertise as well of as the more important correlative expansion of instructional use. A few selected areas are highlighted in the next four tables.

These increases can be attributed to both training and increased expertise as well as to general growth of e-mail use in society.

One important marker is that more than half the instructors now put their **e-mail addresses** on their syllabi.

Table 3
Is your e-mail address on your syllabi?

	1997	1999	2001
Yes	20.37%	42.26	55.73
No	50.25	40.79	30.21
Not Applicable	29.37	16.95	14.06

E-mail to students has tripled over four years.

Table 4
In the past year have you done any of the following:

	1997	1999	2001
Sent e-mail to CCSF students	22.64%	46.22	69.88

Faculty are increasingly utilizing **computers for work** to the extent that over 95% of respondents use a computer for work at least once a week.

Table 5
How often do you use a computer for work?

	1997	1999	2001
Daily	48.60%	56.87	64.68
A few times each week	26.17	27.27	22.89
Once a week or less	14.64	11.84	8.96
Never	10.59	4.02	3.48

Faculty use of **web pages** as an instructional resource or for course activities shows a dramatic increase over two years, but at 17% still does not show substantial penetration into the faculty as an instructional tool. The combined "Currently Use" and "Would Like to Use" has increased only 5%. City College at 17% use trails the 24.9% national average for use of web pages in public community college courses (Green, Kenneth C. Campus Computing 2002: The 13th National Survey of Computing and Information Technology in American Higher Education. Encino: The Campus Computing Project, 2002).

> *It might be worthwhile to pursue further the question of why half the College faculty are not showing strong interest in web pages (this is the "not selected" category in Table 6—faculty who neither indicated that they currently use or want to use web pages.) There are also a substantial number—nearly a third—who would like to use web pages but currently do not. With answers to these questions, the institution then might be able to determine if it would be worthwhile to make a college-wide effort to increase the number of faculty who want to and are able to use web pages in an instructional context. One strategy currently under consideration is developing an easily managed web page template for faculty web pages.*

Table 6
Instructional resources and course activities:

USE A WEB PAGE	1997	1999	2001
Currently Use	*Not asked*	9.87%	17.28
Would Like to Use	*Not asked*	33.61	30.86
--not selected--	*Not asked*	56.51	51.85

4. Desire to Use Computer Technology

The most puzzling responses to the survey came in the questions about whether faculty would like to use various forms of technology in instruction. These numbers often suggest a downward trend or trend which is flat overall as in Table 6 above. Clearly some faculty have moved from a desire to pursue use of a particular technology to actual use, but those aggregates of "Currently Use" and "Would Like to Use" are not increasing. Given choices of use, want to use, and no selection, faculty have increased their percentages of no selection in use of **lab assignments** and **class sections in computer labs** (see Appendix: A and B).

At the same time, faculty are finding that institutional barriers are becoming less of a problem in **access to instructional classrooms,** in **technical support,** and in **access to computer labs** (see Appendix: C, D, E). In **access to computer labs,** the surveys show that from 1997 to 2001, the percentage of faculty finding "Not a Problem" has increased from 30% to 52%.

> *One must ask where the new "want to use" faculty are for lab based instruction and computer use in classrooms or what has happened to the old "want to use" faculty? The plateau does not appear to be caused by problems of access or lack of support. Are faculty opting out of using technology because of pedagogical reasons or are they finding the upper level computer skills too daunting? These questions should be explored, particularly in those departments which are undertaking curricular change to use labs more fully.*

Two areas of computer use have clearly not been embraced by the faculty: (1) the use of **listserves**; (2) the use of presentation software such as **PowerPoint** (See Appendix F and G).

In these areas one might assume that the management burdens (particularly for listserves) and disproportionate effort for generally minuscule learning gains (PowerPoint) have chilled enthusiasm.

Some areas offer more encouragement. Use of **internet materials** and **electronic data bases** has increased considerably, especially the use of internet materials which has increased over 100% in the four years covered by the surveys (See Appendix H).

Most other areas are stable or show modest increases (See Appendix I).

5. How Faculty Value the Use of Technology

The responses to questions about how technology aids in instruction show that faculty who are using technology do see various individual applications as a value added, and their numbers are increasing. Faculty are increasingly seeing value in **access to new resources, creativity presenting material, increased student response, ability to deal with student problems** (Appendix J, K, L, M,). A new category in the most recent survey shows that 57% of faculty rate **ability to work with disabled students** in higher benefit categories (Appendix N)

Despite showing an increasing benefit in technology in a number of areas, faculty show little change in rating **overall quality of teaching** (Table 7). An additional paradox is that the percentages of faculty who report **overall teaching enjoyment** (Table 8) as a value of technology declined after the first survey and did not recover, and these percentages are lower than the above areas of value added.

Table 7

What is your best judgment about the way computers and information technology resources have benefited your teaching?

OVERALL QUALITY OF MY TEACHING	1997	1999	2001
1-NO BENEFIT	14.65%	11.32	10.65
2	11.09	14.02	13.91
3	26.34	28.30	26.92
4	21.98	21.56	24.26
5-MAJOR BENEFIT	25.94	24.80	24.26

Table 8

ENJOYMENT OF MY TEACHING	1997	1999	2001
1-NO BENEFIT	16.23%	31.62	27.83
2	8.82	13.68	11.62
3	21.24	18.52	22.02
4	21.84	13.39	15.60
5-MAJOR BENEFIT	31.86	22.79	22.94

6. Professional Development and Support

While it is clear that the great majority of faculty regard their computer abilities as adequate for their jobs, the number who feel their skills only "somewhat" meet job needs has remained steady at around 23%.

> *Once again we have a moving target because at the same time faculty may have improved skills, the job demands may also have increased. Nevertheless, these figures should be studied with some attention. Is the reason that faculty do not show strong desire to use a web page or web assignments in instruction because of lack of skills? When we see the increases of faculty using e-mail in instruction, it is an easy reach to assume that this increase comes because e-mail is an easily acquired skill. What increases in "use" and "want to use" would come if we could reduce the burdens of the learning curve?*

Table 9
How well does your computer expertise match your job needs or requirements?

	1997	1999	2001
Completely	21.00%	26.12	25.90
Generally	42.32	44.20	47.95
Somewhat	23.98	22.99	22.56
Not at all	5.02	2.90	2.56
Not Applicable	7.68	3.79	1.03

Percentages of faculty utilizing the **help desk** still appear rather modest considering the large potential for users (Table 10). More advanced faculty use the help desk in greater percentages than beginners (Table 11).

If beginners and non-users are not calling upon the help desk in large numbers, it could be because of lack of awareness of the service. It will be interesting to look at these numbers again after the roll out of the new computers.

Table 10
How often did you use the CCSF Help Desk this semester?

	1997	1999	2001
Never	*Not Asked*	71.36%	68.52
Once	*Not Asked*	7.83	13.49
Twice	*Not Asked*	3.36	8.99
Three times or more	*Not Asked*	6.71	8.73
No response	*Not Asked*	10.74	0.26

Table 11
Frequency of Help Desk Use by Expertise, 2001

	Non-computer user	Beginner	Intermediate	Advanced
Never	0.00%	64.22%	71.04	62.00
Once	0.00	10.77	13.12	17.07
Twice	0.00	6.15	8.14	14.63
Three times or more	0.00	16.92	7.69	6.10
No response	0.00	1.54	0.00	0.00

Table 11
How satisfied were you with the assistance you received from the Help Desk?

	1997	1999	2001
Not satisfied	*Not Asked*	2.93%	2.11
Somewhat satisfied	*Not Asked*	6.40	9.97
Very satisfied	*Not Asked*	16.80	27.49
Not applicable	*Not Asked*	73.87	60.42

7. Questions
This report has touched only selected highlights of the Technology Survey. For questions or more complete data, contact Steve Levinson (239-3233, slevinso@ccsf.edu) or Pamela Mery (239-3227, pmery@ccsf.edu).

APPENDIX

A.

Instructional Resources and Course Activities

COMPUTER LAB ASSIGNMENTS	1997	1999	2001
Currently Using	24.34%	25.42	29.63
Would Like To Use	29.92	24.58	19.01
--not selected--	45.74	50.00	51.36

B.

Instructional Resources and Course Activities

COMPUTER LAB CLASSES	1997	1999	2001
Currently Using	19.69%	26.26	29.63
Would Like To Use	33.95	24.79	20.00
--not selected--	46.36	48.95	50.37

C.

What kinds of problems or difficulties do you encounter?

ACCESS TO INSTRUCTIONAL CLASSROOMS	1997	1999	2001
1-NOT A PROBLEM	29.03%	40.07	42.05
2	13.65	15.75	15.15
3	21.34	17.47	18.94
4	13.90	10.62	10.61
5-MAJOR PROBLEM	22.08	16.10	13.26

D.

What kinds of problems or difficulties do you encounter?

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT STAFF	1997	1999	2001
2	15.94	16.00	16.78
3	22.27	22.15	19.13
4	19.43	15.08	14.09
5-MAJOR PROBLEM	20.96	15.69	11.41

E.

What kinds of problems or difficulties do you encounter?

ACCESS: STUDENT COMPUTER LAB	1997	1999	2001
1-NOT A PROBLEM	30.40%	39.65	51.72
2	14.32	18.60	14.94
3	21.36	18.60	17.24
4	14.57	8.77	9.20
5-MAJOR PROBLEM	19.35	14.39	6.90

F.

Instructional Resources and Course Activities

LISTSERVE TO STUDENTS	1997	1999	2001
Currently Use	3.26%	6.72	7.16
Would Like To Use	22.17	22.90	20.25
--not selected--	74.57	70.38	72.59

G.

Instructional Resources and Course Activities

PRESENTATION SOFTWARE	1997	1999	2001
Currently Use	13.80%	14.92	15.56
Would Like To Use	35.04	29.83	31.11
--not selected--	51.16	55.25	53.33

H.

Instructional Resources and Course Activities

MATERIALS I FOUND VIA THE INTERNET	1997	1999	2001
Currently Use	23.57%	38.24	50.62
Would Like To Use	19.84	14.08	10.62
--not selected--	56.59	47.69	38.77

MATERIALS I FOUND USING THE CAMPUS LIBRARY'S ELECTRONIC DATABASE(S)	1997	1999	2001
Currently Use	6.51%	8.82	23.70
Would Like To Use	19.69	19.75	13.58
--not selected--	73.80	71.43	62.72

I.

Instructional resources and course activities:

2001 Responses	Currently Use	Would Like To Use	--not selected--
Overhead Projector	50%	12%	38%
Self-Paced Software	14	26	60
Computer Simulations or Courseware	9	23	68
On-Line Instruction	8	23	69
Telecourses	3	17	80

J.

What is your best judgment about the way computers and information technology resources have benefited your teaching?

ACCESS TO NEW RESOURCES FOR MY TEACHING	1997	1999	2001
1-NO BENEFIT	15.63%	11.75	9.55
2	12.11	13.32	9.83
3	24.80	20.10	16.85
4	18.55	18.02	20.51
5-MAJOR BENEFIT	28.91	36.81	43.26

K.

What is your best judgment about the way computers and information technology resources have benefited your teaching?

CREATIVITY IN PRESENTING MATERIAL TO STUDENTS IN NEW WAYS	1997	1999	2001
1-NO BENEFIT	16.93%	15.46	15.61
2	14.37	11.08	13.58
3	22.05	24.74	17.63
4	18.90	17.01	19.08
5-MAJOR BENEFIT	27.76	31.70	34.10

L.

STUDENT RESPONSE TO THE CONTENT OF MY COURSE(S)	1997	1999	2001
1-NO BENEFIT	23.70%	25.00	22.47
2	12.68	11.78	10.76
3	23.08	24.43	21.84
4	19.75	15.80	18.67
5-MAJOR BENEFIT	20.79	22.99	26.27

M.

ABILITY TO HELP STUDENTS EXPERIENCING PROBLEMS WITH COURSE MATERIALS	1997	1999	2001
1-NO BENEFIT	34.50%	32.83	24.62
2	13.32	14.16	13.23
3	22.71	23.49	18.77
4	14.19	15.06	20.00
5-MAJOR BENEFIT	15.28	14.46	23.38

N.

ABILITY TO WORK WITH DISABLED	1997	1999	2001
1-NO BENEFIT	*Not Asked*	*Not Asked*	15.03%
2	*Not Asked*	*Not Asked*	10.12
3	*Not Asked*	*Not Asked*	18.10
4	*Not Asked*	*Not Asked*	20.25
5-MAJOR BENEFIT	*Not Asked*	*Not Asked*	36.50

CCSF Survey on Using Technology
Administrators, Department Chairs, Classified Staff, and Student Services
February 25, 2003

1. Introduction

In 2001, the Office of Research conducted its Biennial Technology survey of all City College of San Francisco employees to assess use of and progress in acquiring computer skills. This same survey was given in 1997 and in 1999, and a survey of smaller scale had been given in 1994, so there are adequate benchmarks to detect important trends. This report on the data will focus on all College employees except classroom instructors and librarians. For the purposes of this report "employees" refers to classified staff, department chairs, administrators, and student service faculty. These employees generally share two characteristics that distinguish them from instructional faculty: (1) they do their work on computers at their desks on site, an advantage that many instructional faculty have lacked, to date; (2) they need to use computers in their work while faculty can develop alternate strategies to deliver instruction. Student Services faculty are included in this report because in their work they tend to use of computers in similar ways to administrators, chairs, and classified staff.

2. Expertise

Respondents were asked to self-evaluate their expertise as either "**beginner,**" **"intermediate"** or **"advanced"**. In the years covered by the surveys, employees have made tremendous progress that must be recognized but also is predictable in that the general population has made a similar leap. Conversely, over the years covered by the schedule the range of computer powers has expanded, so it is possible that responders might still regard themselves as beginners even though their email and word processing skills have expanded considerably. Even most "beginners," use email, do word processing, and have skills in accessing material through the internet. Of the classified staff responders in the most recent survey 97% use **email**, 90% do **word processing**, and 99% report some degree of **web skill**-- 97% use a **computer for work** at least a few times a week.

Classified staff show a steady improvement in assessment of skills with the combined Non-user and Beginner categories dropping from 24% to 11% over four years.

My level of computer expertise is: Non-Computer User; Beginner; Intermediate; Advanced.

	1997	1999	2001
Non-computer user	3.82%	2.16	1.33
Beginner	20.49	14.22	9.33
Intermediate	58.68	59.48	63.56
Advanced	17.01	24.14	25.78

Administrators have shown clear progress in their skills. Over four years those assessing their skills as beginner have almost halved while those regarding themselves as advanced have near doubled.

	1997	1999	2001
Beginner	25.71%	13.79	13.04
Intermediate	60.00	72.41	60.87
Advanced	14.29	13.79	26.09

Department Chairs have shown the greatest overall progress in reducing the number of beginners, but the most recent survey shows little progress since 1999.

	1997	1999	2001
Beginner	21.21	12.90	11.11
Intermediate	69.70	70.97	74.07
Advanced	9.09	16.13	14.81

Student Services faculty showed a significant increase in their assessment of their expertise between 1997-78 and 1999, but the most recent survey shows a leveling off of progress with 18% still at beginner level.

	1997	1999	2001
Non-computer user	1.79	1.92	0.00
Beginner	37.50	19.23	17.74
Intermediate	55.36	71.15	77.42
Advanced	5.36	7.69	4.84

Administrators and Classified staff have continued their climb toward the more advanced categories, but both Department Chairs and Student Services appear to have made their greatest advances in the first two years covered by these surveys.

3. Match of Skills to Job

Employees responded more positively than in prior years to the question of **how well job skills fill job needs**. In 2001 responses showed Complete or General satisfaction at a combined rate of between 76% and 96% in the various non-faculty categories. (Instructional faculty responded with 74%.)

How well does your computer expertise match your job needs or requirements?

ADMINISTRATION	1997	1999	2001
Completely	14.29%	32.14	30.43
Generally	57.14	57.14	65.22
Somewhat	25.71	10.71	4.35
Not at all	2.86	0.00	0.00

DEPARTMENT CHAIR	1997	1999	2001
Completely	12.12%	9.68	8.00
Generally	36.36	58.06	68.00
Somewhat	45.45	32.26	24.00
Not at all	3.03	0.00	0.00
Not Applicable	3.03	0.00	0.00

STUDENT SERVICES FACULTY			
	1997	1999	2001
Completely	7.02%	11.32	11.48
Generally	52.63	54.72	73.77
Somewhat	33.33	24.53	13.11
Not at all	3.51	1.89	1.64
Not Applicable	3.51	7.55	0.00

CLASSIFIED			
	1997	1999	2001
Completely	30.42%	30.30	42.04
Generally	45.80	51.52	38.94
Somewhat	15.73	12.55	14.16
Not at all	3.85	3.03	0.88
Not Applicable	4.20	2.60	3.98

4. Institutional Support

All of the non-faculty categories show diminishment of problems over the four years covered by the surveys. This section will emphasize **classified employees**, the largest of the non-faculty groups. **Hardware** and **Software Funding** continue to be the top-ranked problems; however, even these concerns have diminished. The following charts show diminishing problems in **Access to CD-Roms and Multimedia, Network Access and Connection, Equipment Setup and Connection, Technical Assistance.**

What kinds of problems or difficulties do you encounter using computers and other kinds of information technology?

MAJOR PROBLEM	1997	1999	2001
Hardware Funding	68.16%	48.83	46.94
Software Funding	61.75	44.87	43.68
Incentives	41.58	37.88	34.22
Training	43.51	32.68	22.01
Multimedia	47.69	32.70	19.33
Equipment Setup	39.95	25.17	18.66
Technical Assistance	42.81	22.33	17.74
Admin Support	36.39	23.08	15.46
Incompatibility	27.41	17.79	12.67
Department Support	17.40	13.78	12.33
Network Access	42.60	25.92	11.22

Classified Staff seem to be increasingly relying on the **Technology Learning Center** and the **Help Desk.**

	TLC as a Source of Information		
	1997	1999	2001
1-NOT IMPORTANT	*Not asked*	24.43	18.75
2		10.80	11.36
3		21.59	27.27
4		16.48	14.20
5-VERY IMPORTANT		26.70	28.41

Help Desk as a Source of Information			
	1997	1999	2001
1-NOT IMPORTANT	*Not asked*	36.78%	27.93
2		7.47	10.61
3		20.69	18.99
4		13.22	16.76
5-VERY IMPORTANT		21.84	25.70

The responding classified staff seem to reflect an increasing comfort with using computer technology. The progress in skill/job match, the higher self assessment, and clear diminishment of problems suggest that the CCSF progress toward greater uses of computer technology has gone well with this group. The shift toward the TLC and the help desk for sources of information suggest that these new CCSF offices are fulfilling their function.

5. Department Chairs

Department Chairs have clearly made progress over the four years covered. 96% of chairs report daily use of a computer for work. Between 1999 and 2001 chairs' use of spreadsheets increased from 45% to 63%. Chairs mirror the classified in responses about institutional support and diminishing problems. Although 68% of chairs in the most recent survey feel that their **computer skills** generally match job needs, only 8% feel completely satisfied. In the somewhat satisfied category Department Chairs lead all segments of CCSF staff with 24% reporting somewhat of a match of computer skills to job needs.

Because the institution depends so much on the productivity of department chairs it would be valuable to study what barriers are preventing chairs from reporting a complete match of computer skills to job needs. Further study should look to determine how much of the negative response is due to difficulty with Banner (see section 7).

6. Student Services

As noted above the Student Services faculty have made great progress in their assessment of how their computer skills meet their job needs. In the most recent survey 85% of Student Services faculty felt completely or generally satisfied with the **skills/needs**

match. Great progress has also been made in the number of student services faculty who have **sent e-mail to students** within the last year.

In the past year have you done any of the following: sent e-mail to CCSF students?

	1997	1999	2001
Email: CCSF students	29.31%	37.74	73.02

Though the doubling of e-mail to students is impressive, the question that nevertheless must be asked is if these responses mean that 27% of student services faculty are not available to students by e-mail. Though not all counselors have case loads, email might be a valuable tool for follow up questions to these counselors. This response should be studied further by the department.

7. Banner

Questions about Banner were asked for the first time in 2001.

In the past year have you... accessed information from Banner directly?

Administration	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Instructional Faculty	Stud. Service Faculty
69.57%	58.95	85.19	26.67	68.25

The data above offers only a narrow window into the use of Banner at City College of San Francisco. Without knowing what percentages in the various groups would be expected to use Banner in their work, it is difficult to know how we are doing, but it does appear that we are not getting optimum use out of Banner. Both counselors and department chairs would presumably find Banner a valuable tool in daily work, so driving down the number of non-users would be an important goal. In the next survey it might be worthwhile to ask the following:

(1) How much difficulty are you having with Banner?

(2) How well do your Banner skills meet your Banner job needs?

(3) *How well does Banner meet your job needs?*

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

X	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").